Smith's Report

No. 210 *Challenging the Holocaust Taboo Since 1990* November 2014
Online at www.codoh.com

Heretics, Sacralization, and Fear in the Heart of the Journalist

What follows is an exchange (not) between Albert Richardson of the British website What Really Happened? (http://tinyurl.com/oc9g8un) *and Will Storr, a highly praised British journalist who is interested in "heretics," though not so much it appears as he was before being addressed by Mr. Richardson. In the event, Storr represents journalists as a class, weak and fearful throughout the English-speaking world.*

Dear Will Storr: I picked up your book *The Heretics* in the library without previously knowing anything about it. It has proved to be a fascinating read, especially the chapter on the workings of the brain and the fallibilities of perception and of memory, though of course most of the book relates directly to them too. This connects closely with my own interests in recent years; my library list includes Gilovich's *How We Know What Isn't So*, Ariely's *The (Honest) Truth about Dis-Dishonesty*, and Macknik & Martinez-Conde's *Sleights of Mind*. There are frequent references in these works to Kahneman and Tversky and much of what you wrote was already familiar to me. What I have brought away from these readings is awareness of the aforementioned fallacies of perception and memory, and of the power of confirmation bias, which I see constantly in others and, of course, less frequently in myself. I have also read quite a lot about Elizabeth Loftus and false memory, as well as watching one of her TED talks.

I found myself wondering whether you were actually going to tackle the only real heresy of our time, the one for which people's careers are destroyed, they are sent to prison for periods of years or flee into exile to avoid this, or they are victims of brutal violence, arson and even murder. It was therefore with mixed feelings that I reached your chapter on David Irving: satisfaction that you had elected to take this particular bull by the horns but disappointment that you had chosen an easy target, disappointment that was reinforced on seeing that you here abandoned your willingness to look at the "heretical" view with the even-handedness you had displayed in other chapters.

Irving is an easy target. He is the only "Holocaust Denier" most people have ever heard of (though he is not really a "denier" any more), he is a racist, he has been thoroughly vilified in the media and he has the reputation of being difficult to get on with at the personal level, although he used to have a rather engaging personality in his public speaking. I noticed, though, that you subjected him to guilt by association in insisting on some of the more unpleasant utterances of those who went on his tour. (I wonder how selective you were.) Along with this, you also subjected "Holocaust Denial" to guilt by association both with Irving and with these racist remarks. It should be clear to anyone

that the truth or otherwise of assertions about historical facts is unaffected by the political and social views of any individual making or rejecting such assertions today.

People who make the kind of extreme racist remarks you cite are a tiny minority in society today, though such views were the norm in earlier generations, something that we should bear in mind when passing judgment on individuals from those earlier times; Churchill, for example, widely revered as a hero today, was an appalling overt racist by my standards or yours. Clubs in Hong Kong had "No dogs or Chinese" signs. Segregation flourished in the American South, and Blacks could not vote. It was to last another 20 years after the war. Even the US Army was segregated.

"Holocaust Deniers" are also a small minority, but a very large part of the racist set will belong to this second set. Result: a significant proportion of "Holocaust Deniers" will be prejudiced racists. This tells us nothing about the validity of Holocaust Revisionist (the proper term) arguments. Some of the Revisionist historians incline toward conservative social views, for example on homosexuality or mixed marriage, but the most important current writers such as Carlo Mattogno, Germar Rudolf, Jurgen Graf or Thomas Kues either do not hold such opinions or have not spoken on these topics.

The first person to question the story today known as the Holocaust was Paul Rassinier, a French Socialist who was sent to Buchenwald and Dora for his Resistance activities. He barely survived and returned an invalid; the conditions he describes were horrific. However, after the war he observed former prisoners, mainly Communists, making accusations that he did not recognize and he made it his business to interview everyone he could find who claimed to have seen a gas chamber. It turned out in every case that they had not seen a gas chamber and had simply been repeating hearsay.

If you had genuinely wanted to look at the "heresy" of "Holocaust Denial" you could have spoken to serious scholars who have spent a lifetime researching the topic. Interesting though your experiences with Irving and his followers were, I, for one, would have liked to see you engage with serious, moderate Revisionists such as Bradley Smith, David Cole, Germar Rudolf, Carlo Mattogno, Samuel Crowell, Jurgen Graf or Thomas Kues. Far from being "enemies of science" it is they who have pushed for properly controlled forensic investigations and the guardians of orthodoxy who resist them[1].

It might be difficult with Mattogno, as he is Italian and does not speak English (surprisingly in that one of his strengths is his fluent knowledge of both German and Polish and he communicates with Bradley Smith in Spanish). Also, Rudolf, a former doctoral student at the Max Planck Institute who was expelled because of his work on the Holocaust, may hesitate to speak openly, as the United States, where he now lives, previously deported him to Germany where he served a 3-year prison sentence for writing a

Continued on page 6

Will Storr is the author of three critically acclaimed books, including his *The Heretics: Adventures with the Enemies of Science.* He is acclaimed by the British and American press.

Will Storr

His website lists reviews of his latest books as follows:

Salon: A searching, extraordinarily thoughtful account of what it means to believe anything.

Michael Shermer in *The Wall Street Journal*: A subtle brilliance.

The Daily Telegraph: Funny, serious, richly vivid.

The Independent: Investigative journalism of the highest order.

The Sunday Telegraph: A humane and generous book.

The Guardian: Confounds expectations.

Esquire: Incontrovertibly brilliant.

Grazia: Brilliant.

Daily Express: Utterly engros-sing.

BBC Radio Oxford: Astounding.

Will Storr represents the best of journalism in the English language. At the same time he is unwilling to entangle himself in any discussion about the Holocaust that is heretical. Is it because he is a Jew? I don't think so. Let me say it again. It's not "them." It's us.

News and Notes

Bradley Smith

***** Siegfried Verbeke:** "After reading SR 208 I put together these remarks. Fred Töben wonders whether he was wasting his time on David Cole. Prof. Faurisson gave him the right answer in five words: 'David Cole is a clown,' and Fred Leuchter, more friendly, concludes 'Cole's claim of fame is a mere footnote to revisionist history.' We should not spend more attention on David Cole. He is an ego-tripper, who after a short revisionist career discovered how much courage and self-abnegation one needs to go to the end of the road. He was not eager to accept these consequences. Cole also discovered how much hate his own people fuels in others. He preferred to escape Jewish wrath. Is this not *Menschliches, Allzumenschliches*?

"I'm a little bit puzzled about what Cole writes: 'Faurisson is displeased that I point out in my book that he froze on the witness stand at the Zündel Trial when asked about the *Einsatzgruppen* operations in the East after the invasion of Russia'.

"I have to confess that I also got 'frozen' by reading *Ordinary Men* (Christopher Browning), *Messages of Murder* (Ronald Headland), *The Einsatzgruppen Reports* (Yitzhak Arad and others), *The Nuremberg SS-Einsatzgruppen Trial* (Hilary Earl). I was horrified and could not sleep very well for some time. The big question was: was this true, and how was this possible? I started to gather as much information as I could find, and luckily I got the complete and original story: the microfilms containing 3331 pages, which I studied and analyzed.

"I came to the conclusion that those reports on the contrary prove without any doubt that there was not a plan of genocide. The real picture is completely different to what is presented in those mainstream history books. I hope to publish my first findings this year. I'm no longer 'frozen' but understand very well the situation confronted by Faurisson, while he didn't have any first-hand knowledge of these reports.

"Fred Töben spoke with the French pharmacist (not a chemist) Jean-Claude Pressac, who told him that the word 'Holocaust' should be replaced by 'massive massacre'. Scrutinizing the 3331 pages of the *Ereignismeldungen UdSSR* and *Meldungen aus den besetzten Ostgebieten* (and the 40 volumes of the IMT Trial) it's in my opinion more correct to speak about 'collateral damage'.

"P.S. Faurisson's famous words 'no holes, no holocaust' is in some way not correct, because the Germans could have gassed their victims very easily, by introducing Zyklon B with a '*Kreislauf*' system in the ceiling of the crematory building, using the chimney that ventilated the morgues. I thought I discovered this myself, but later I found out that Germar Rudolf had gotten ahead of me in his book *Vorlesungen*.

"Grrr. . . ."

***** HITLER TAMED BY PRISON. Released on Parole, He Is Expected to Return to Austria.**

Copyright, 1924, by *The New York Times Company*. By Wireless to *The New York Times.*

BERLIN, Dec. 20.—Adolf Hitler, once the demi-god of the reactionary extremists, was released on parole from imprisonment at Fortress Landsberg, Bavaria, today and immediately left in an auto for Munich. He looked a much sadder and wiser man today than last Spring when he, with Ludendorff and other radical extremists, appeared before a Munich court charged with conspiracy to overthrow the Government. His behavior during his imprisonment convinced the authorities that, like his political organization, known as the Volkische, was no longer to be feared. It is believed he will retire to private life and return to Austria, the country of his birth.

***** We're in the process** of sending the promo for *A Personal History of Moral Decay* to people all over the internet. So far, there is little reaction. My problem, not anyone else's.

***** Gilad Atzmon :** The holocaust religion is the conclusive stage in the Jewish dialectic; it is the end of Jewish history for it is the deepest and most sincere form of 'self-love'.

Rather than inventing an abstract God who prefers the Jews to be the chosen people, in the holocaust religion the Jews cut out the divine middle substance. The

Jew just chooses oneself. This is why Jewish identity politics transcends itself beyond the notion of history. God is the master of ceremony. And the new Jewish God cannot be subject to humanly contingent occurrences. The new Jewish God, i.e. 'the Jew', just rewrites fables that serve the tribe at any given time. This may explain why the Holocaust religion is protected by laws, while every other historical chapter and narrative is debated openly by historians, intellectuals and ordinary people. – As one may guess, with such a self-centered intensive world-view, not much room is left for humanity, grace or universalism. It is far from being clear whether Jews can collectively recover from their new religion. However, it is crucial that every humanist stands up against the hol-ocaust religion that can only spread misery, death and carnage.

Originally published at www.gilad.co.uk

*** **Watching television** last night where a young brother and sister are dancing and singing and dedicating their act to their father, who had served three turns in Vietnam. I am somehow moved to the point of tears by their singing and the camera moving to the face of their father who is in the audience. I don't quite get it.

Afterwards it occurs to me to wonder why, when I am so interested in my own story, that I was so little interested in my father's story. His family moved from Maryland to Johnstown Pennsylvania in the 1890s where some of them went to work in the coal mines. My father ended his schooling after the fourth grade and went to work in the mine on a moving belt where he would pick out the slate from the coal piece by piece and throw it—where? I never asked him. He was ten years old. How long did he work? Did either of his brothers work in the mines?

I never asked my father how it was to ride the rails, as they used to call it, from Pennsylvania to Los Angeles. I think he was seventeen. That would have been 1905. He found a job in a parking lot downtown and one day when we were driving on 5th street I think he pointed it out to me. It was still there. That must have been about 1945.

I never asked my fathere how he chose to go Guaymas, a city on the west coast of Mexico, to work in bridge construction. Or about how he got mixed up in trafficking arms to Mexican revolutionaries by airplane. Or the story about the time when they were making a delivery that he was shot in the leg. I never thought to ask him how he and the pilot made it out of there that day.

It didn't occur to me to ask my father how he found work selling French "bonds" door to door in the late Twenties, or what his reaction was the first time he knocked on the door where my mother lived then with her family in Santa Monica. What happened in those first moments of being in each other's company that would lead to their marriage? He was 42 years old that day, she was 29. I would like to know. I never asked him how he followed that meeting into prospecting for silver and tungsten in the desert mountains of central California. I never asked him about any of that. Sometimes he would volunteer fragments of those stories but I never followed up. Why not?

I'm the guy who found himself wholly, utterly, captivated with his own experience of being shot, and a few months later being hit with grenade fragmentation, yet even with those experiences I never thought to ask my father to tell me the story about that day in a Mexican desert where he was shot by—whom? Revolutionaries? Federal police? Simple thieves? It's as if before the Chinese woke me up back in 1951 with their hand grenades and machine guns, I was sleepwalking. Then, once I was awake, it became entirely about me. Utterly.

*** **Fritz Berg: "**The simplest way to dispose of thousands of corpses quickly is to simply throw them into a large pit or ravine outside Budapest, or wherever one has one of those huge railroad disinfestation gas chambers. Pull the bodies out of the RR cars by hand and toss them. Wear rubber gloves and gas masks if necessary. Why would more than that be needed? Why should anyone be afraid that the corpses might be dug up to provide embarrassing evidence of mass murder later on?
"At Treblinka, there are supposedly 800,000 Jewish corpses in the ground just waiting to be dug up—but no one has dug up even one of them yet. Similar mass graves supposedly exist of non-cremated corpses at other *Aktion Reinhard* camps and no one has found any of them either. The *Einsatzgruppen* supposedly murdered 1-1/2 million Jews all over Russia—but none of them have been brought to the surface either. So, why would cremation or incineration have even been necessary for Birkenau's Jews?

Continued on page 10

Orson Welles and the First Holocaust Movie: A Lasting Legacy

(With a tip of the hat to Mr. Steven Spielberg)

By Jett Rucker

If the pinnacle of the Holocaust Movie genre has been reached, it may have happened in 1993, when Steven Spielberg's *Schindler's List* garnered seven academy awards and untold millions of dollars in royalties for the film magnate who has since declared that the reason he has honored Planet Earth with a personal visit is to "educate people" about the Holocaust. To this end, he founded the USC Shoah Foundation at the University of Southern California and has funded it with many millions of dollars, likely representing but a small fraction of the pelf he has received from other pursuits of his mission in this vale of tears that we are privileged to share with him.

By mid-2014, Wikipedia had compiled a list of 191 "narrative" movies concerning the Holocaust, a number that omits so-called "documentary" movies treating the same subject. Although Spielberg may be the champion among them, what is derisively called "Shoah business" has been good to great numbers of propagandists and other profiteers in addition to Spielberg, perhaps the greatest illusionist of Hollywood.

This avalanche, like every avalanche, must have started with a mere snowball, somewhere. And this one did, of course. But the snowball can still be seen, in its original form, through the miracle of the medium of film, in this case wielded not by Steven Spielberg (who was born in 1946), but by his worthy predecessor (who is not known to have announced the purpose, or reason, for his life), Orson Welles. Welles's is the first film to appear in the chronological list of 191 cinematographical works treating our present subject, and released in the year of Spielberg's birth.

By mid-2014, Wikipedia had compiled a list of 191 "narrative" movies concerning the Holocaust, a number that omits so-called "documentary" movies treating the same subject.

Viewing Welles's *The Stranger* in the present day can impart the feeling of entering some sort of time warp; the film, released 68 years ago, adumbrates events and attitudes of 2014 in ways that this reporter finds outright stunning. And it does this in a milieu so obviously and clumsily contrived that it could call into question the predicates underlying many, if not most, of the 190 or so moving on-screen experiences that followed in its train.

The anti-heroic hero of this black-and-white classic is played by the Rumanian Jew known to movie audiences as Edward G. Robinson, while his indelibly stained quarry is played by none other than Welles himself, a fugitive Nazi who inexplicably commands the English language not only fluently, but with not the slightest trace of an accent, neither German nor even British. Also inexplicably, our villain, ensconced in a small town in Connecticut as a history teacher who seems to favor subjects such as "Friedrich der Grosse," has won the hand of a daughter of a Supreme Court justice, who (the daughter) inexplicably is found alone on her wedding day hanging drapes in her imposing future home, the very one somehow acquired by that incognito fugitive villain she marries later in the day. But the intrepid government agent played by Robinson (born Goldenberg) has penetrated this improbable halcyon through the ruse of releasing a lesser criminal and tracking his movements, leading to the small Connecticut town and even the school at which the central villain pursues his evil agenda of infecting young minds with the ideological poison to which he evidently has devoted his twisted, worthless life.

The wedding, of course, takes place, but no more of this cinematic creation is devoted to the ensuing nuptials than the noting of a brief honeymoon to no place of mention, during which the dead body of the

hapless "tracer" criminal is discovered, and the search for his killer launched. Our man Robinson is still on the job, his suspicions aroused by an unguarded remark by his target to the effect that Karl Marx was, rather than a "German," a "Jew."

And it goes on, complete with a display to the unsuspecting newly-wed bride of film footage released the previous year by Billy Wilder of concentration-camp inmates' bodies being bulldozed into mass graves, while Robinson intones his suspicions that her groom is none other than the behind-the-scenes mastermind of the Nazis' recent horrific genocidal enterprise so graphically portrayed on a home-movie screen. She (Loretta Young) becomes perhaps the world's first Holocaust denier, by denying that her beloved could have originated any such hellacious scheme, and so was not the person Robinson was so assiduously pursuing.

Welles's character ends up being spectacularly impaled upon the sword of one his own creations, and falling to his on-camera death several stories below. His death at that time prefigured the executions suffered by hundreds, if not thousands, of Germans accused and "convicted" of heinous crimes such as seen in the footage of British soldiers pushing the bodies of victims who had died only after liberation into trenches. The narrative treats of various "pacification" initiatives then being imposed upon the populace of defeated Germany, no doubt including fuller displays of the footage only glimpsed in this production, and in no way even hinting at the genocidal expulsions being imposed at the same times on the long-standing ethnic German populaces of the Sudetenland and East Prussia.

Perhaps the most forceful thought that this experience of time-travel brought to my mind was, What would Welles have thought if he had known that, in 2014, a Czech guard at a concentration camp would be incarcerated, in his (Welles's) own USA (Philadelphia) for deportation to Germany, there to stand trial for complicity in the genocidal atrocity that Welles's film brought for the first time to screens viewed by the moviegoing American public?

Indeed, what might Robinson have thought? Or Young? The matter in reality has much exceeded the bounds of the merely grotesque. We learn today that, in all seriousness, a 93-year-old SS guard who is accused of handling the luggage of persons brought to concentration camps is being hauled before the unforgiving eye of "justice" as it is known in the Federal Republic of Germany.

Welles's fictional demon was someone whose functional scope appeared to be somewhere between that of the "banal" Adolf Eichmann and, say, Heinrich Himmler. Today's villains are, perforce, far beneath even the functionary Eichmann's level—the dregs, one might say metaphorically, of the vast apparatus that ultimately was deployed to extricate Germany from the fate of "unconditional surrender" that had been declared for her by her malefactors.

But it all ended well—very well indeed—for those who managed to hitch their wagons to the star launched in the first year after the War by Orson Welles, he of the vaunted 1938 radio "news" broadcasts of Martian landings as depicted in H. G. Wells's *War of the Worlds.*

The fiction of Martian landings on earth has long since been dispelled. The fiction of demonic Nazis intent on world domination and the murder of every Jew on the face of the earth, unfortunately, remains alive and quite well, indeed very well, even to the present day, seven decades later. It might be very different had Martians, rather than Nazis, been the reason why Steven Spielberg was put on this earth.

Heretics, Sacralization, and Fear in the Heart of Journalism

Continued from page 2

scientific analysis of the chemistry of Auschwitz, which updated and remedied the weaknesses in Fred Leuchter's report. Cole[2] is an American Jew who in the early Nineties exposed the Auschwitz gas chamber as a post-war "reconstruction" by the Soviets and presented the Revisionist position in mainstream TV programs. He received death threats from the Jewish Defense League (a criminal organization in the United States today, whose leaders were later jailed and died in jail) that forced him to sign a bogus recantation and to change his name and go underground until his cover was

blown last year by an angry ex-girlfriend. However, with him there are issues I have raised in the footnote.

Bradley Smith is a likeable and articulate man who has campaigned for years for open debate on the Holocaust in American Universities. He is tolerant and in no way racist: as a bookseller in Hollywood he had many Jewish friends, he was previously married to a Jewish woman and his present wife is Mexican. I'd suggest the best people to talk to would be Bradley himself, Jurgen Graf, Thomas Kues, Samuel Crowell or an associate of Bradley's, David Merlin. Bradley would be able to put you in touch with the others (bradley1930@yahoo.com).

You might also talk to the British Jewish Revisionist, Paul Eisen.

You will have gathered by now that I have some sympathy with the Revisionist viewpoint. It doesn't come from any predisposition to racist or authoritarian views. I usually vote Liberal Democrat or Green and read the *Guardian*. In the Political Compass I am firmly in the bottom-left, liberal corner. Every time I take the test I try hard, when in doubt, to choose the more right-wing answer, but I remain stubbornly in that corner.[…]

Until about 1990 I was an unquestioning believer in the reality of the Holocaust allegations. I accepted the conventional view that Holocaust Deniers were bovver-booted Combat 18 followers who denied the self-evident because of their worship for Hitler and their hatred of Jews. At the same time, however, I did take a relativist view of the Second World War: that it was total war in which any pretensions to morality went out of the window and all sides did whatever was deemed necessary, whether it was murdering people in gas chambers, vaporizing cities and their inhabitants with incendiary or atom bombs or inciting troops to kill and rape (Soviet-Jewish propaganda officer Ilya Ehrenburg). The pretense that we were "the good guys" is also belied by later Western behaviour in Kenya, Algeria, Palestine, Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, etc. Just a few decades earlier Americans and Australians had largely wiped out their indigenous populations. It seemed to me that Hitler's mistake was doing to light-skinned people what we only did to brown- or black-skinned people.

I thought that the Holocaust Denial laws in some countries had been passed in the immediate aftermath of the war, and were part of the attempt to suppress any pro-Nazi revival. It was only more recently that I learned that they have mostly been passed in the last 25 years: in France, Switzerland and Germany around 1990, in Hungary as recently as 2011 and Russia 2014.

My first doubts about the Holocaust were awakened by Norman Finkelstein in *The Holocaust Industry*. Finkelstein, as you probably know, is an American-Jewish University professor and son of survivors of the Warsaw ghetto, Auschwitz and Majdanek who has not openly questioned the Holocaust but claims it has been hijacked by the predominantly American Jewish establishment, in order to whip up support for Israel and to extort money from Germany and the Swiss banks. I heard vaguely of David Irving but was not aware of his suit for libel against Deborah Lipstadt.[3] When Irving was jailed in Austria I thought it was a travesty of justice and was pleased to see that this view was widely shared by some of his strongest opponents, including Deborah Lipstadt and Melanie Philips. At this point I thought that the Holocaust Denial laws in some countries had been passed in the immediate aftermath of the war, and were part of the attempt to suppress any pro-Nazi revival. It was only more recently that I learned that they have mostly been passed in the last 25 years: in France, Switzerland and Germany around 1990, in Hungary as recently as 2011 and Russia 2014.

I became curious as to what Irving's arguments might be. When he came out of prison he was interviewed by John Humphrys on *Today*. Humphrys asked him "Do you deny that the Nazis killed six million Jews in the Holocaust?" Irving replied "I don't accept a package. I reserve the right to open that package and look inside." This seemed to me an incontrovertible argument. He went on to say that there were no gas chambers in Auschwitz and that the main killing took place in remote areas to the North in the Aktion Reinhard camps.

Incidentally, he was right when he told you that the cylinders at Majdanek contained CO_2 and not CO. It is marked on the cylinders themselves. (http://tinyurl.com/mlmxdft) The number of alleged gas chambers at Majdanek has gone down from 5 to 2. No proof is offered for any of them.

From that point, I was very much open-minded as to what had happened but tended to think that

Irving's position was very probable. It led me to look at his website. I later widened this search to look at "Holocaust Denier" sites in general and my first shock was to find that the image spread by their opponents of total denial was false. They did not question the deportations or the camps or that many people died as a result. They even produced those horrific pictures from Belsen in 1945 in support of their position. These people had died not from murder by the Germans but from disease, starvation and exposure in the breakdown of infrastructure in the final months of the German collapse. The main killer had been typhus. I had never seen this in mass media sources and yet it is true and accepted by all historians. Nevertheless, the BBC website still dishonestly cites Belsen as "proof of the Holocaust". I also found that the Zyklon B, which I had assumed was specially manufactured for murderous use in gas chambers, was in fact a legitimate commercial product used in similar form throughout the world to destroy disease-carrying lice, in the days before the discovery of DDT. Gas chambers certainly existed, said the Revisionists, but to kill lice.

I continued to explore the Revisionist position. I was greatly put off by the anti-Jewish attitudes of some supporters and reacted negatively to use of the term "hoax". [4] On YouTube I found some quite revolting comments, but also some thoughtful ones critical of the Holocaust story. I read lots of books and watched hours of video. I found much of it plausible but I still needed a motive and evidence of fraud. I finally found them in the Nuremberg Tribunal and in the actions of Allied Psychological Warfare teams charged with the production of propaganda to support the de-Nazification program and to justify the war.

Finally, a word about the relevance of the Holocaust to the main themes in your book. The orthodox story relies almost entirely on witness testimony. We know how faulty memory and perception are, and in particular how easy it is to plant false memories in people, either deliberately or simply because they think they know what is expected of them. Elizabeth Loftus intended to appear as an expert witness at the trial of John Demjanjuk in Israel to defend him against the witness accusations (wrong, as it turned out) that he had been a guard at Treblinka. She was persuaded by peer pressure from fellow Jews not to do so, with the result that Demjanjuk was found guilty and would have been hanged had he not been acquitted on appeal, but only after spending five years on Death Row. A measure of the power of peer pressure, but something which Demjanjuk's supporters never forgave her for.

Thank you for taking the time and the trouble to read this far. Please take a few more minutes to look at
www.biblebelievers.org.au/holohoax.htm

I wrote the home page, and also the page you come to if you click on the thinker.

Yours sincerely,
Albert Richardson

[1] It is not surprising that Leuchter's study contained some flaws given that it was carried out both hurriedly and clandestinely behind the Iron Curtain, but if his findings were unsound it should be possible to demonstrate this by carrying out similar tests under controlled conditions. Caroline Sturdy Colls's forensic investigations at Treblinka have, quite literally, barely scratched the surface and any thorough investigation is stopped by the Polish Chief Rabbi, who, curiously, is an American.

[2] David Cole is brilliant and articulate but his experiences seem to have driven him to alcohol. He is currently in conflict with most other Revisionists as he, like Irving, thinks that Treblinka, Sobibor and Belzec, the Aktion Reinhard camps, were indeed death camps. Also, he has in the last few days fallen out with Bradley Smith, his friend of 25 years, in a Facebook confrontation where he uses intemperate language. For these reasons I don't recommend him anymore [. . . .]

[3] Lipstadt is a thoroughly racist personality whose Jewishness is the dominating feature in her life and who virulently opposes mixed marriage. She isn't a historian. She's a professor of Jewish Religious Studies.

[4] I still do. I think it is oversimplistic and even has overtones of "joke".

Dear Will,

At one point in *The Heretics* you raise the concept of "sacralisation", how certain issues are raised above the level of opinion and treated with unquestioning religious reverence. Examples given were "markets" for the right and "climate change" for the left. They are raised to the level of dogma where questioning, far from being welcomed as part of the normal process of scientific examination, is treated as heresy: the critics are not

responded to but vilified and their points ignored.

The one issue above all others subject to this sacralisation is, of course, beginning around 1980, the Holocaust. The capitalization is one indication of this. No questioning of any aspect or detail of the Authorized Version is tolerated. Although it is clear, for example, that the figure of six million is not based on demographic evidence (it appeared as early as 1944), it is a never-changing dogma, imposed by constant incantation, though it is not clear what it means. Is it total Jewish deaths in the War, does it refer to all Jewish deaths under German custody and control, or only to those deliberately killed in an alleged programme of extermi·nation? People regularly refer to "six million killed in gas chambers", but those in charge of the story have never alleged this. Historians Reitlinger and Hilberg only managed totals of just over 4 million and 5 million respectively, but the Six Million still remains the sacralised figure.

The Holocaust has its priests (Eli Wiesel, Simon Wiesenthal, etc.), its temples (USHMM and other memorial museums), its pilgrimage sites, its saints (the best-known is Anne Frank) and even holy relics (piles of hair and shoes). The dogma is propagated in the media, with no criticism allowed, and school lessons teach the creed with no pretense to objective historical method. You may feel that my observations are in bad taste, but that is, of course, a function of the sacralisation process.

A major feature of this sacralisation of "The Holocaust" is that it becomes a single global concept which must stand or fall as a whole. A false dichotomy is creat-ed, so any questioner is called a "Denier" with the implication that he rejects everything, which is false. While Revisionism, too, has its dogmatists and bigots, for the most part those who have doubts about the official version do not question that the Nazis persecuted the Jews, imprisoned and deported them in appalling conditions where many died. Most accept that a substantial number were killed on the Eastern front, though they generally question the basis of the numbers quoted, and seek to place this in the context of total war with reprisals on civilians by all parties: German, Soviet, Nation-alist, and partisan, including Jewish partisans. They question the policy of extermination and the use of gas chambers, for which they say material evidence is lacking. They wish to examine all the evidence and to exercise skeptical doubt in its absence. The public authorities refuse this, whether it be the alleged gas chambers in Auschwitz, or the alleged burial sites at Treblinka.

Your own failure to reply may perhaps be evidence of this sacralisation. No questioning is allowed. We do not debate with "Heretics", however reasonably they may present their points.

Best regards,

Albert

Dear Will,

You comment several times in *The Heretics* that our opinions, including your own, are frequently formed by what we unconsciously wish to be true. You refer to your unwillingness to consider that life might exist elsewhere in the universe.

I ask you to consider, if only for a few minutes, the possibility that your dismissal of any questioning of the conventional account of German treatment of Jews in the Second World War is similar, that maybe some details of this conventional account are not proven with 100% certainty and that it is legitimate to open the topic to objective examination, just like any other, rather than to ruin careers and impose lengthy prison sentences for attempting to do this.

Almost without exception, people who now question the official account once believed it for the same subliminal reasons you would not accept the possibility of extra-terrestrial life. It was only after overcoming much internal resistance that they accepted that some aspects (only some—no one questions anti-Semitic persecution and that there were many deaths) might be less well supported by the evidence than is generally believed. Consider that this is a factual historical issue unaffected by the opinions of some (only some) who were first led to question it by their personal prejudices.

I don't expect you to enter into correspondence, but a polite acknowledgement would reassure me that you are not approaching this topic with a completely closed mind. Best regards,

Albert

http://whatreallyhappened.info

NEWS AND NOTES Bradley Smith

Continued from page 4

"Just gas the Jews and dump them somewhere—and cover them up with dirt. Big deal!!

"The RR disinfestation gas chambers would have certainly worked for mass murder of countless Jews and e-a-s-i-l-y. The technology was already there and in place. Anyone reading almost any of the German literature on Zyklon-B would have had it staring them in the face from the picturesque advertisements for Zyklon-B. Before anyone would have used Zyklon-B for anything, they certainly would have read and studied that literature including even the advertisements. How could anyone have not connected the dots to figure it out for themselves? See: www.nazigassings.com

*** **Richard Widmann** writes to say "I love the new line in your letterhead: '*Some of it happened, some of it didn't.*' It's terrific." If Widmann likes it, I'm okay.

*** **At the VA I did the blood work** and then met with my oncologist. He very carefully went through the results, the accumulated data on the cancer in his computer and my own chat about the exhaustion and so on. He speaks very quietly. In the end he said he was not going to continue the chemotherapy at this time. My immune system is too low, the white blood count is not good, the red blood count shows me to be anemic, some other stuff. To continue the chemo at this time would run the risk of hurting as much as helping me. The last thing I had expected. He set up an appointment for me to get a PET scan the first week in January where he could get a picture of what is developing inside the body and decide on the best course of treatment.

*** **Smith Tweets:** #Monsanto partners with U.S. Feds to produce pesticides (a personal note here) linked to lymphoma and other cancers http://tinyurl.com/m54jnju

*** **Richardson writes Will Storr one last time**: "Dear Will. I challenge you to read the article I link to below and still claim that challenges to the orthodox version of the Holocaust are spurious and driven by prejudice and hatred. See the reasoned analysis of some serious historians, not the racist rants of a Maidstone lorry driver. [The article referenced here is "The Great Holocaust Mystery: Reconsidering the Evidence" by Thomas Dalton and published by *Inconvenient History*:

http://tinyurl.com/oezavtc.]

"If, after reading this short article you still believe that, you are either very stupid or deeply prejudiced yourself. Having read your book, I do not believe you are stupid, quite the contrary. Neither do I think you are deeply prejudiced except on this one issue, where, for the present, your mind is completely closed. Go ahead and do it. Read it. It's not long. At least afterwards, if you still maintain the position you hold at present, you can do so in the knowledge that you have looked at the other side of the issue.

"Best regards, Albert"

(No reply by Storr as of this time. Again.)

*** **Frank Brunner:** "On October 7, 2014, I was sentenced to 5 months jail by the *Cour de Justice* (high court) of Geneva. The story began in January 2009, during the Gaza war. A Jewish organization called CICAD based in Geneva sued me for having criticized the mass Jewish support for Israeli war crimes. Since then, this organization sent more complaints against me, because I published more reports about the Jewish lobby, Jewish slander campaigns, Jewish Islamophobia campaigns, Jewish persecution campaigns, and also because I published reports about holocaust denial.

"I produced to the *Cour de Justice* two big folders full of proofs showing the truthfulness of all my reports, but the judges refused to take any of my proofs into account. The fact that I wanted to prove the truthfulness of my reports was even considered as worsening the case against me. Regards. FB."

*** **Lewis Lapham (one-time editor of *Harper's Magazine*):** "I have had three children. My youngest is now 25, my eldest is 32. They all went through a very high-end American education, both secondary schools and colleges. The syllabus of books that they were given in the English courses was terrible. I mean, the books were all tracts.

"There was a big fuss about Oprah Winfrey and the James Frey book, and she's now going to put on **Elie Wiesel's *Night*** [on her TV show]. This is really one of the worst books I have ever read, and I've had to read it three times to my

three children; it's junk. But it's the kind of junk that has become very de rigeur in American universities. It's a propaganda poster. With the kind of books the kids are given to read, I mean, it would turn them off books forever. No wonder! Because they are being given tracts. And, the big subject of course is victimology."

(Alexander Cockburn at http://tinyurl.com/mbge7c8)

*** **Statement by Head of British Intelligence about gas-chamber stories.** Public Record Office Document, FO 371/34551 This Foreign Office document was declassified ages ago, after the 30-year period, and yet David Irving seems about the only British historian who has wanted to comment upon it.

"27 August, 1943 In my opinion it is incorrect to describe Polish information regarding German atrocities as 'trustworthy.' The Poles, and to a far greater extent the Jews, tend to exaggerate German atrocities in order to stoke us up. They seem to have succeeded.

"Mr Allen and myself have both followed German atrocities quite closely. I do not believe that there is any evidence which would be accepted in a Law Court that Polish children have been killed on the spot by Germans when their parents were being deported to work in Germany, nor that Polish children have been sold to German settlers. As regards putting Poles to death in gas chambers, I do not believe that there is any evidence that this has been done. There have been many stories to this effect, and we have played them up, in P.W.E. [Psy Warfare Executive] rumours without believing that they had any foundation. At any rate there is far less evidence than exists for the mass murder of Polish officers by the Russians at Katyn. On the other hand we do know that the Germans are out to destroy Jews of any age unless they are fit for manual labour.

"I think that we weaken our case against the Germans by publicly giving credence to atrocity stories for which we have no evidence. These mass executions in gas chambers remind me of the story of employment of human corpses during the last war for the manufacture of fat, which was a grotesque lie and led to the true stories of German enormities being brushed aside as being mere propaganda… ."

(signed) V Cavendish-Bentinck
From *What Really Happened:*
http://tinyurl.com/jwc3pyu

*** **Steven Spielberg and the Shoah Foundation:** We have sent three pieces to some 5,000 students and adults at USC. Not 50, or even 500, but 5,000. The first was the article by Jett Rucker publshed herein titled *Orson Welles and the First Holocaust Movie: A Lasting Legacy* (With a tip of the hat to Mr. Steven Spielberg)

The next was a promo for my *A Personal History of Moral Decay* with the note about Smith being the first Holocaust revisionist to be associated with such figures as William Burroughs, Henry Miller, Charles Bukowski and Hemingway. Here I was looking for some few on campus who would be interested in such literary figures.

Now we have sent Thomas Dalton's *The Great Holocaust Mystery: Reconsidering the Evi-dence,* originally published in *Inconvenient History.* Here are the opening paragraphs.

"The Holocaust is the greatest murder-mystery of the 20th century. Six million Jews, we are told, perished at the hands of the Nazis—in gas chambers, ghettos, and concentration camps. They were starved, suffocated, and shot. Their bodies were buried in mass graves, or burned in the ovens of Auschwitz, or on open flames. And all simply because they were Jews. It was the embodiment of evil, the greatest crime ever perpetrated.

"Traditional historians claim to know about this crime in great detail. They have documents, photoraphs, and hard evidence. They have incriminating testimony from key Nazis. Some of the gas chambers have survived. And they have innumerable Jewish eyewitnesses. According to some, it is the 'most well-documented event in history.'1

"And yet, when we ask detailed and pointed questions, our historians fall short. They don't really know when, where, or how the Jews died. They have no technical explanation of how it was possible, for example, to gas thousands of people per day in a single room, and then to dispose of their bodies—such that not a trace remains. They cannot find the mass graves that allegedly held thousands of bodies. They cannot explain wartime aerial photographs that show a disturbingly calm Auschwitz camp. And they refuse to even consider a raft of contradictory evidence. In fact, many aspects of the traditional story simply don't add up. The deeper we look, the more puzzling the picture becomes—and hence, the great mystery. . . . "

*** ***Hitler's Furies: German Women in the Nazi Killing Fields***, by Dr. Wendy Lower, the John K. Roth Professor of History at Claremont McKenna College (in Southern California).

"*Hitler's Furies* focuses on the transformations of individual women in the inner workings and outer landscapes of the Holocaust — in the offices, among the occupational elite, in the killing fields. Often those who seemed the least likely to perpetrate the Holocaust's horrors became the most entangled and involved,"

Lower wrote in her book.

"The consensus in Holocaust and genocide studies is that the systems that make mass murder possible would not function without the broad participation of society, and yet nearly all histories of the Holocaust leave out half of those who populated that society, as if women's history happens somewhere else."

Reviewed in The *New York Times* with the heading "Nazism's Feminine Side, Brutal and Murderous" I find that

"German school-girls were not taught subjects such as Latin, since knowledge of this kind was not necessary for future mothers,"

What does that suggest for we American school-boys and girls who were not taught latin in the 30s and 40s during the reign of Roosevelt? While Latin was not necessary for American girls to become mothers, what was it not necessary for American boys to become? Without Latin were we being prepared by the State to participate in the intentional mass-murder of German and Japanese women and children? Would Latin have made a difference?

From what I can make out from the reviews of Dr. Lower's *Hitler's Furies* is that it is loaded with eyewitness testimonies about the monstrous behavior of German women with little documentary evidence. It's all he-said, she-said, according to someone else. I may be reading it wrong. It would be good if one of "us" were to do a serious review of the book.

*** **The Rialto school system:** A couple montns ago the 8th graders at Rialto were given an assignment to judge the truth of the mainline Holocaust story. The response was scandalous. Many of the kids became "deniers.

What were those texts? Because I could not find them, my interest in the story remained low. A couple days ago, when the story was once again in the press, I emailed the journalist who had written on it. I suggested the revisionist texts I was looking for were being "hidden."

Beau Yarbrough replied that the sources were not being hidden, that they are here:
www.biblebelievers.org.au/holohoax.htm

I was surprised to find that the revisionist materials the Rialto students were guided to included articles and websites featuring Herman Otten, Mark Weber, Jim Reddin, Joseph Sobran, David Cole and Bradley Smith. There were four articles by Smith alone. This may call for more work on my end. Who was it, specifically, who provided their 8th grade students with such sources? I do believe this question has been addressed, but not solved. Now it's my turn?

Bradley

*****

If you find this work worthwhile, please take a moment to contribute.

CREDIT CARD (ONLINE)

We have a Merchant's Account with Bank of America. Use our absolutely secure First Data Global page to make your donation Online.
http://tinyurl.com/mp5nohe

CHECK or CASH

We have used our present mail service here in *Baja* for 16 years. No problems. Mail to:

Bradley R. Smith
PO Box 439016
San Ysidro CA 92143

WIRE TRANSFER

Bank Branch: HSBC Mexico, S.A. 0133 Rosarito
Bank Address: Benito Juarez 2000, Rosarito, BC 22710, Mexico
Account Number: 6347793344
SWIFT Code: BIMEMXMM

***Smith's Report* is published by Committee for Open Debate On the Holocaust**
Bradley R. Smith, Founder
www.codoh.com

For your contribution of $39 you will receive 12 issues of *Smith's Report*.
Canada and Mexico--$45
Overseas--$49
Letters and Donations to:

Bradley R. Smith
Post Office Box 439016
San Ysidro, CA 92143
Desk: 209 682 5327

bradley1930@yahoo.com
Blog: www.codohfounder.com